

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-16, 18-21 and 55 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended as shown on page 2 of the Reply. Claim 55 has been newly added. Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Sax for the teleconference of April 10, 2008 wherein existing rejections of claims were discussed. It is further requested that any Office Action issued with new grounds of rejection be non-final as the new grounds of rejection are not necessitated by the amendments submitted in this response.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-16, 18-21 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-16, 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, due to certain informalities. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of amendments to independent claim 1.

II. Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Examiner asserts that this claim recites a computer readable medium which may in fact be a signal and such a medium is not statutory. However it is respectfully submitted that claims are read in view of specification and nowhere in specification has a computer readable medium included a signal. Hence computer readable medium does not include signal (See, Specification, page 16, line 7-16) and hence computer readable medium as recited in subject claim, is statutory.

III. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-16, 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-16, 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Newell, *et al* (20030219226) and Moore *et al* (U.S. 20040230599). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested since Newell *et al.* fail to teach or suggest all aspects of subject claims while Moore *et al.* and the subject application share a common assignee.

Applicants' claimed invention relates to systems and methods providing rich previews of documents, projects, and other digitally stored items *via* automated decomposition of such items

in the form of graphical representations that are rendered by an associated user interface. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *an interface component further includes a preview display enabling users to inspect two or more non-homogeneous sets of one or more items, wherein each set comprises at least one item associated with a text application, a project, a task, a presentation, a graphics application, or an email application, and the interface component facilitates selection of a 2 or 3 dimensional axis for rendering data, files, or documents as icons or display objects allowing users to inspect, probe, and navigate among the subcomponents of the items at a focus of attention before launching a full application.* Newell *et al.* neither teaches nor suggests such novel aspects.

Newell *et al.* provides methods and system for accessing video data stored on a storage device. A processor is used to generate a preview sequence comprising video sequences extracted from each video programme in the storage device. The preview sequence contains a plurality of video sequence and other textual or graphical data related to the programmes displayed.

At page 3 of Office Action, Examiner incorrectly asserts that Newell *et al.* substantially teaches a decomposition component that automatically segregates at least one information item into a collection of subcomponents relating to the item *by analyzing properties of the item including a type of the item, an item structure and an item content.* The cited portion of the reference (Newell *et al.*) provides for accessing video data stored on a hard disk storage device. A processor is used to generate a preview sequence comprising video sequences extracted from each video programme in the storage device. The preview sequence can be provided as a grid containing a plurality of video sequences and other textual or graphical data related to the programmes displayed and further can be provided as a sequence of video sequence (*See*, Paragraph [0009]). Video sequences in the grid can have a number of different arrangements depending upon the preference of the user. Fig. 1a shows a four by four grid arrangement of 16 video sequences and Fig. 1b shows eight video sequences arrangement leaving space for descriptive text to accompany each video sequence (*See*, Paragraph [0019]). The grid of video sequence can be rectangular and further can be distorted. If the number of stored programs exceeds the capacity of a single grid, then a second preview sequence grid could be made available. Shape of video sequences in the grid (rectangular or any other shape) is decided by metadata and user preferences. Metadata is supplementary to the main data, that is being

transmitted and acts as a means for describing the main data (*See*, Paragraph [0028] & [0029]). Hence Newell *et al.* provides for generating a preview of video sequences in the form of a grid and the grid of video sequence having a number of arrangements and further shape of the grid of video sequences to be rectangular or other desired shape being decided by metadata and user preferences. More particularly, Newell *et al.* provides for generating a second preview sequence grid in addition to a first preview sequence grid if number of stored programmes exceed the capacity of a single grid. Hence the reference (Newell *et al.*) is limited only to preview of video sequences in a number of arrangements and nowhere teaches or suggests *analyzing properties of the item including a type of the item, an item structure and an item content* let alone providing for previewing sequences of *text applications, projects, tasks, presentation or graphics applications, and email documents*. The claimed subject matter facilitates users to inspect, probe, and navigate among document subcomponents of items at focus of attention, before “launching” a full application. For digital items, *the structure of the preview hinges on an analysis of the nature of the type of items at focus of attention* (e.g., is this a Powerpoint file, a Word document, a set of interrelated emails, a set of pictures, *etc.*). The structure of the document (e.g., number and sequence of pages, figures appear on a subset of pages, interrelated emails, sequence of images taken over time, *etc.*), details about the content of the items and metadata capturing such information as the when and how often different components were created, modified, or accessed.

The Examiner concedes that Newell *et al.* does not teach all limitations recited in the subject independent claims, and attempts to cure the deficiencies of Newell *et al.* with Moore *et al.* However, it is noted that the filing date of the subject application is June 30, 2003 and the filing date of Moore *et al.* is May 16, 2003 and that the subject matter of Moore *et al.* and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to Microsoft Corporation. Accordingly, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) would not be proper pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(c). Hence, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of independent claim 1 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 18-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Newell *et al* (2003/0219226) and Moore *et al* (2004/0230599) and Card *et al* (2005/0005246).

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Newell *et al.*, Moore *et al.* and Card *et al.* either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all features of the subject claims. In particular, Card *et al.* merely relates to displaying images of a virtual three-dimensional book having one or more virtual page and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Newell *et al.*, Moore *et al.* with respect to amended independent claim 1 (which claims 18-20 depend from).

It is further noted that the filing date of the subject application is June 30, 2003 and the filing date of Moore *et al.* is May 16, 2003 and that the subject matter of Moore *et al.* and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to Microsoft Corporation. Accordingly, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) would not be proper pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(c).

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of dependent claims 18-20 should be withdrawn.

V. New Claim 55

Newly added claim 55 emphasizes novel aspects of the invention discussed *supra* in connection with claim 1. Support for this claim can be found in the specification as filed at page 9. Accordingly, this claim is patentably distinct over the art of record for at least the same reasons as is claim 1.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP461US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731